

SUMMARY RESULTS:
SWING ARM CITY-FACTORY BUTTE SURVEY

Prepared for:
Bureau of Land Management
Richfield Field Office
Henry Mountain Field Station

Author:
Douglas Reiter
Research Associate
Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
Utah State University

Steven W. Burr
Director
Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
Utah State University

IORT-PR-2011-2
August 31, 2011

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	1
Mission of the Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism	1
Background	2
Data Collection Methods	3
Demographic Characteristics	4
Swing Arm City-Factory Butte Visitation.....	8
Swing Arm City-Factory Butte Facilities, Information, and Policies.....	14
Comments and Concerns	16
References	18
Appendix A.....	19
Appendix B	25

List of Tables

Table 1: Counties where Utah respondents reside.....	4
Table 2: Length of residency in current town or city	5
Table 3: Number of people residing in respondents' households.....	5
Table 4: Number of children residing in respondents' households.....	6
Table 5: Respondents' highest level of formal education	6
Table 6: Respondents' pre-tax household income	7
Table 7: Number of years since respondents first visited area	8
Table 8: Number of times visiting the area in a typical year for respondents who had been to the area before.....	8
Table 9: Number of days visiting the area on a typical trip	9
Table 10: Number of people in group on a typical trip.....	9
Table 11: Number of days visiting the area on this trip.....	10
Table 12: Where respondents stayed overnight or are planning to stay	10
Table 13: Type of campsite respondents prefer when visiting the area	11
Table 14: Number of people in group today.....	11
Table 15: Primary recreation activity.....	12
Table 16: Other recreation activities	12
Table 17: Level of satisfaction with trip to area.....	12
Table 18: Information sources where respondents first found out about Factory Butte area	14

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Myron Jeffs with the Bureau of Land Management, Richfield Field Office, Henry Mountain Field Station, for spearheading this research as well as recruiting, training, and overseeing volunteers used to interview visitors to the Swing Arm City-Factory Butte area. I would also like to thank Jascha Zeitlin and Chase Lamborn, Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Research Assistants, for their help in designing the research survey instrument and methodology. I would also like to thank the volunteers who graciously gave up their free time to interview visitors. Finally, thank you to the folks visiting and playing in the area. Without you, there would not be information that will hopefully assist in management decisions designed to provide you with a fun, enriching, and beautiful recreation experiences.

Mission of the Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism:

The Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism (IORT) conducts a program of research, extension, and teaching for the benefit of the people of Utah, our country, and the world, directed at improving our understanding of the relationships between outdoor recreation and tourism, natural resources management, community economic vitality, and quality of life.

Through statewide collaboration and cooperation, IORT will be a source for the creation, communication, and transfer of knowledge on resource-based recreation and tourism issues affecting social, economic, and environmental systems, in order to assist Utah's citizens in making decisions that enhance both community and resource sustainability.

Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
College of Natural Resources
Utah State University
5220 Old Main Hill
Logan, Utah 84322-5220
(435) 797-7094
e-mail: steve.burr@usu.edu
IORT website at extension.usu.edu/cooperative/iort

Background

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Richfield Field Office's 1982 Management Framework Plan officially designated most of the area around Factory Butte open to cross-country motorized recreation. However, emergency restrictions in 2006 restricted use to designated routes and the Swing Arm City open area (BLM, 2006). These restrictions were put in place due to unacceptable off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation impacts to the Winkler pincushion cactus (*Pediocactus winkleri*) and Wright fishhook cactus (*Sclerocactus wrightiae*) species, one listed as threatened and the other endangered under the 1973 Endangered Species Act (BLM, n.d.; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2009). The area remains popular with OHV recreationists and the restrictions in place have been quite contentious (High Country News, 2006).

Based on conversation with managers at the BLM Henry Mountain Field Station, it became apparent that managers possessed insufficient knowledge of current recreational use and recreation users of the Factory Butte Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Therefore, this visitor use survey was designed to obtain baseline data regarding recreational use of the area. Given the recent closure of much of the SRMA and the potential of re-opening portions, some of the most immediately pertinent information for BLM managers will be data regarding knowledge of closed and open areas, and recreationists' perceptions of the reasons for the closures and management restrictions in place. This will enable managers to evaluate current means of disseminating information about closed and open areas of the SRMA.

More general visitor information will allow managers to better understand the recreation users for whom the Factory Butte SRMA is managed in terms of motivations, skill level, location of residence, and a host of other basic visitor attributes. This type of baseline knowledge is also highly useful in identifying any relevant subgroups of recreationists and in targeting managerial or informational efforts more directly at the proper audience.

Data Collection Methods

A four page survey instrument containing 44 questions was developed by Utah State University (USU), Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism (IORT) social science researchers in collaboration with BLM personnel. Questions included respondent's residence, other demographic questions, familiarity with area, length of stay, recreation activities, impressions of facilities, reasons for area closures, and use of information kiosks. Volunteers who surveyed were enlisted and trained by a BLM recreation planner. See Appendix A for copy of survey form.

On-site interviews were conducted between August 26, 2010, and April 23, 2011. The surveyors approached visitors, asked them if they were 18 years old or older, and asked if they would answer some questions regarding management of the area. If they agreed, surveyors would read the questions verbatim and record the responses on a survey form. A total of 139 surveys were completed.

There were 22 days in which interviews were conducted with 84 (60.4%) interviews on Saturdays, 34 (24.5%) on Fridays, 14 (10.1%) on Thursdays, and 7 (5.0%) on Tuesdays or Wednesdays. There were 39 interviews (29.1%) conducted at noon or before and the remaining 95 (71.9%) after noon (on five survey forms, the time was not noted by the interviewers). Most of the interviews (127) took place in Swing Arm City with two at Factory Butte and five in Caineville (five survey forms did not have the location information recorded). The following report summarizes the results of the surveys.

Demographic Characteristics

A majority of respondents were male (n = 109, 78.4%) and remaining 30 (21.6%) female. Respondents' ages ranged from 17 to 70 years old with the average about 34 years (median = 32). Ten respondents did not tell the interviewer what year they were born in. Almost 80% (110) reside in Utah, nine from Idaho, four live in Wyoming, three from each Minnesota and Nevada, one lives in Colorado, and two each from California, New Mexico, and Oregon. Two respondents reside in Holland.

Table 1 shows the counties where Utah residents live. Swing Arm City-Factory Butte area is located in Wayne County near the Emery County boundary to the north. Those counties and abutting counties (Wayne, San Juan, Sanpete, and Sevier) accounts for 42.7% (n = 47) of Utah respondents. It is interesting to note that about half of the respondents (n = 56, 50.9%) reside in northern counties (Cache, Davis, Salt Lake, Summit, Tooele, Utah, and Wasatch Counties) representing the largest concentration of population in Utah known as the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back.

Table 1: Counties where Utah respondents reside.

County	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Sevier	30	27.3%
Utah	27	24.5%
Salt Lake	14	12.7%
San Juan	7	6.4%
Wayne	7	6.4%
Davis	4	3.6%
Summit	4	3.6%
Cache	3	2.7%
Sanpete	3	2.7%
Wasatch	3	2.7%
Box Elder	2	1.8%
Duchesne	2	1.8%
Washington	2	1.8%
Tooele	1	0.9%
Uintah	1	0.9%

¹n = 110

Table 2 show the response rates when respondents were asked the length of time they have resided in the town or city where they currently live. Nearly six of ten respondents (60.4%) indicated eleven years or more and only 9.4% (n=13) said two years or less.

Table 2: Length of residency in current town or city.

Years	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Less than one year	5	3.6%
One to two years	8	5.8%
Three to five years	19	13.7%
Six to ten years	23	16.5%
Eleven to twenty years	28	20.1%
Over twenty years	56	40.3%

¹n = 139

Respondents were asked, “Including yourself, how many people live in your household at the present time?” The average number of household residents was 3.8 with a median of 4.0 and a modal category of four. Nearly three-quarters (72.4%) of the respondents live in households of four or less (Table 3).

Table 3: Number of people residing in respondents’ households.

Number	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
One	6	4.5%
Two	26	19.4%
Three	28	20.9%
Four	37	27.6%
Five	17	12.7%
Six	9	6.7%
Seven	8	6.0%
Eight	1	0.7%
Nine	1	0.7%
Eleven	1	0.7%

¹n = 134

Respondents were also asked, “Of these household members, how many are children under the age of 18?” The average number of children in respondent’s household was 1.4, with a median value of 1.0 and a modal category of zero. Nearly half (48.5%) said there are one or two children in their household (Table 4).

Table 4: Number of children residing in respondents’ households.

Number	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Zero	45	33.6%
One	29	21.6%
Two	36	26.9%
Three	15	11.2%
Four	3	2.2%
Five	6	4.3%

¹n = 134

When asked the amount of formal education respondents had acquired, about one-quarter (26.0%) indicated a high school degree or less (Table 5). About one- fifth said either an associate or college degree each. Only seven respondents said they had earned an advanced degree (e.g., Masters, PhD, MD, JD, etc.).

Table 5: Respondents’ highest level of formal education.

Formal Education	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Less than a high school degree	6	4.3%
High school degree or GED	30	21.7%
Some college	40	29.0%
Two year technical or associate degree	28	20.3%
Four year college degree	27	19.6%
Advanced degree	7	5.1%

¹n = 138

Table 6 shows the results of the question that asked respondents to indicate the category which best fits their household income for tax year 2008. Only 17 respondents (13.6%) had incomes under \$30,000 whereas 48 (38.4%) had household income in excess of \$75,000. The modal category is \$50,000 to \$74,999 (n = 43, 34.4%). Fourteen respondents (10.1% of 139) either declined to answer this question or were unsure of the amount.

Table 6: Respondents' pre-tax household income.

Household Income	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Less than \$20,000	13	10.4%
\$20,000 to \$29,999	4	3.2%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	8	6.4%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	9	7.2%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	43	34.4%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	22	17.6%
\$100,000 to \$149,000	12	9.6%
\$150,000 or more	14	11.2%

¹n = 125

Swing Arm City-Factory Butte Area Visitation

Respondents were asked if they were first time visitors to the area. Of the 139 respondents, 39 (28.1%) said yes and the other 100 (71.9%) said no. The ones who said they had been there before were asked how many years had it been since they first visited the area. Table 7 shows that a majority (54.2%) first visited five years or sooner. Another 31.2% (n = 30) said they had come to the area ten or more years ago.

Table 7: Number of years since respondents first visited area.

Years	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
1-2 years	30	31.3%
3-5 years	22	22.9%
6-10 years	14	14.6%
10 -20 years	17	17.7%
More than 20 years	13	13.5%

¹n = 96

Those respondents who had been to the area before were then asked how many times they visit in a typical year. The average number of times was 3.2, with a median of 2.0 and a modal category of two (sum = 318 yearly visits). As shown in Table 8, nearly two-thirds (65.3%) said they come one or two times in a typical year. More than one-fifth (21.4%) of the respondents said they visit five or more times per year.

Table 8: Number of times visiting the area in a typical year for respondents who had been to the area before.

Number of Times	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Less than once a year	1	1.0%
One	28	28.6%
Two	36	36.7%
Three	7	7.1%
Four	5	5.1%
Five	10	10.2%
Six	4	4.1%
Seven	1	1.0%
Eight	1	1.0%
Ten	1	1.0%
Eighteen	1	1.0%
Twenty	3	3.1%

¹n = 98

Those 100 respondents were then asked how long they stay during a typical trip. Only seven respondents (7.1%) said they usually stay less than one day with an average length of stay of 6.1 hours. For the other 91 respondents (92.9%), the average was 2.8 days (sum = 257 visitor days). As shown in Table 9, almost three-quarters (70.4%) stay two or three days.

Table 9: Number of days visiting the area on a typical trip.

Number of Days	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
One	7	7.7%
Two	31	34.1%%
Three	33	36.3%
Four	16	17.6%
Five	3	3.3%
Ten	1	1.1%

¹n = 91

The respondents who had visited the area before were then asked to estimate the number of people in their groups on a typical visit. The average was 10.7 with a median of 10.0. Twenty two respondents said their typical group size is ten, eleven said 20, 15 said four, eight said their typical group size is five and 15 each, and three respondents indicated 50. Table 10 shows that about one third said between one and five as well as six to ten.

Table 10: Number of people in group on a typical trip.

Number of People in Group	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
1-5 people	32	33.0%
6-10 people	34	35.1%
11-15 people	14	14.4%
16-20 people	13	13.4%
More than 20 people	4	4.1%

¹n = 97

All respondents were asked how long they are staying on the trip when they were interviewed. Only 16 of the 137 (11.7%) who answered the question were staying less than one day with an average of 4.7 hours. The other 121 (88.3%) average stay was 2.6 days with a sum of 318 visitor days. Table 11 shows that about half (51.2%) indicated they were staying one or two days.

Table 11: Number of days visiting the area on this trip.

Number of Days	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
One	17	14.0%
Two	45	37.2%
Three	36	29.8%
Four	17	14.0%
Five	5	4.1%
Ten	1	0.8%

¹n = 121

Respondents were asked if they had stayed overnight in the area before or if they were staying overnight on the trip when they were interviewed. Only 16 (11.5%) said no and 123 (88.5%) said yes. Those 123 were then asked where they stayed or are planning to stay. No one said they were staying or had stayed on the fence line or hill top. As shown in Table 12, almost one-quarter (23.5%) indicated a motel (of the four respondents who had some combination of various accommodations, three mentioned a motel). Almost two-thirds (63.9%, n = 76) said they had stayed or were staying in the Swing Arm City area.

Table 12: Where respondents stayed overnight or are planning to stay.

Accommodations	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Hotel/motel	28	23.5%
Stay with family or friends	2	1.7%
Camp front side Swing Arm City	52	43.7%
Camp back side Swing Arm City	24	20.2%
Other	9	7.6%
Combination of places	4	3.4%

¹n = 119

The 93 respondents who were camping or had camped in the past were then asked how satisfied they were with the camping area. No one was very dissatisfied, two (2.2%) were dissatisfied, three (3.2%) were neutral, 32 (34.4%) were satisfied, and 56 (60.2%) were very satisfied. Even though only two respondents were dissatisfied, 12 respondents commented on factors that detracted from their campground's quality. Several mentioned lack of bathrooms, one mentioned lack of water, another thought it would be a good idea to have a RV dump station, and five comments related to lack of open riding areas or inability to ride out to Factory Butte. There were also several positive comments. One person loved that fact that their puppies could run around. Another liked the fact that they did not have to pay to camp. And several mentioned that it was a nice camping area and scenic country.

All respondents were asked to choose the type of campsite they would prefer to use when visiting the Swing Arm City-Factory Butte area. As shown in Table 13, a majority (51.9%) would use campgrounds

with no amenities and 35.6% would like minimal amenities such as vault toilets and fire rings. Only five respondents said they would like more developed campsites.

Table 13: Type of campsite respondents prefer when visiting the area.

Campsite Type	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
I plan on never camping in area	12	8.9%
Undeveloped sites (no toilets or other facilities)	70	51.9%%
Semi-developed sites with vault toilets and fire rings	48	35.6%
Developed sites with vault toilets, parking, picnic tables, and fire grills	3	2.2%
Highly developed sites with flush toilets, showers, running water, and utility hookups	2	1.5%

¹n = 135

Respondents were asked how many people comprised their group visiting the area when they were interviewed. The average group size was 10.2 people with a median of 9.0. Group sizes ranged from one to fifty. There were multiple modal categories with 16 respondents indicating groups of 10 and three each, 15 said four, 12 said five and two each, and ten said their group size was 12. Table 14 shows that there are a wide variation of group sizes with 56 (41.5%) saying they were with one to five people, 32 (23.7%) said six to ten people, and 27 (20.0%) were in group sizes from 11 to 15. Four respondents reported their group size was 50.

Table 14: Number of people in group today.

Number of People in Group	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
1-5 people	56	41.5%
6-10 people	32	23.7%
11-15 people	27	20.0%
16-20 people	10	7.4%
More than 20 people	10	7.4%

¹n = 135

Respondents were asked what their primary recreation activity was on the day they were interviewed. Nearly 90% (89.1%) said they were riding motorcycles or riding a combination of motorcycles and ATVs (Table 15).

Table 15: Primary recreation activity.

Activity	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Off-road motorcycle riding	65	47.1%
Off-road motorcycle and ATV riding	58	42.0%
ATV riding	9	6.5%
Other off-road vehicle riding	2	1.4%
Photography	2	1.4%
Work	2	1.4%

¹n = 138

Respondents were then asked if they participated in other recreation activities. About one-third (34.1%, n = 47) said they were engaging in other recreation opportunities beside their main one. As shown in Table 16, there are a large variety of activities that visitors to the area engage in from camping and hiking to fishing at Lake Powell.

Table 16: Other recreation activities.

Activity	Activity
Hiking	Mountain biking
Sightseeing	Snowboarding
Horseshoes	Camping
Boating	Fishing at Lake Powell
Cook out	Drink beer
RC cars	Wakeboarding
Rock climbing	Exploring

¹n = 47

When asked how satisfied respondents were with their trip to the area, 84.1% (n = 116) said they were either very satisfied or very satisfied (Table 17). Only 15 (10.9%) said they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. When asked to characterize the factors that detracted from the quality of their trip, 25 offered responses. Most of respondents (22) mentioned the closures, shortage of areas open to riding, or inability to be able to ride to Factory Butte. Two complained about law enforcement (example, "The rangers need to back off and let the kids have fun."), and there were several positive remarks (example, "There are always nice people when you camp out here.").

Table 17: Level of satisfaction with trip to area.

Satisfaction Level	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Very satisfied	78	55.1%
Satisfied	40	29.0%
Neutral	7	5.1%
Dissatisfied	11	8.0%
Very dissatisfied	4	2.9%

¹n = 138

Respondents were then asked to identify recreation facility improvements they would like to see in the area. Nearly three-quarters ((74.8%, n = 95) offered a comment. Most frequently mentioned topic (n = 35) was the request to leave the area as it is and not make any additional improvements. Twenty four respondents would like to see more toilets, 17 said they would like more areas open to riding, and five would like fresh water. One person would like to see more four-wheeler jumps, several would like to see garbage cans, several more would like the road graded, and another would like better signage.

When asked if they were members of any off-highway vehicle groups or clubs, 26 (19.5%) said they were members and 107 (80.5%) said they were not. They were also asked if they were members of any environmental or conservation organization. Only three people said they were members.

Swing Arm City-Factory Butte Facilities, Information, and Policies

Respondents were asked to identify the information sources where they first found out about the Factory Butte area. Fifteen respondents mentioned several sources. No one indicated vehicle dealer/parts store, guidebooks, advertisements, tour guide, local government organizations, and BLM maps or other maps or mapping software. As shown in Table 18, nearly four-fifths (81.3%, n = 113) indicated family and friends, 5.8% (n = 8) said off-road groups or clubs, and 3.6% (n = 5) said web sites.

Table 18: Information sources where respondents first found out about Factory Butte area.

Information Sources	Number of Respondents ¹	Percent
Friends/family	113	81.3%
Off-road groups or clubs	8	5.8%
Web sites	5	3.6%
Radio/television	2	1.4%
Other groups or clubs	1	0.7%
Magazine or newspaper	1	0.7%
Federal government agency offices/personnel	1	0.7%
Maps produce by BLM	1	0.7%
Other	7	5.0%

¹n = 139

Respondents were then asked if they actively sought out information about current use regulations or regulation changes prior to their trip to the area. About one-quarter (26.1%, n = 36) searched for information and the other 73.9% (n = 102) did not. About one-third who said they looked for information did not identify where they looked, 12.9% (n = 18) said the internet (several mentioned motoutah.com) , one person said a kiosk, several said local people, and several more mentioned the BLM or ranger.

They were also asked if they had read the information on the kiosks. Nearly one-third (30.1%, n = 41) said they had read the information and 69.9% (n = 95) said they had not. When those 41 who read the information were asked if the information was useful, 32 (86.5%) said yes and five (13.5%) said no (four respondent's answers were not recorded). Of the 32 who said the information was useful, 19 respondents' comments were noted. Sixteen respondents said they appreciated the maps which showed the areas boundaries and riding areas, four said it clarified regulations, and one said it gave him information about camping. Of the seven who commented on how the information was not useful (two respondents who said the information was useful offered comments about what was also lacking), five said there was not enough information, one said the information was just common sense, and one asked for better maps.

When asked if respondents had heard of the emergency closure at Factory Butte, 57.6% (n = 80) said no and 42.4% (n = 59) said yes. Of the 53 respondents who gave a reason for the closure, endangered cactus was mentioned by 34. Five respondents knew about the closure but said they did not know why. Several thought the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) wants control or can financially benefit from the closure and others mentioned "eco-nuts," "lying tree-huggers," and environmental groups

unjustly using the Endangered Species Act to close the area. One person thought someone was making a movie.

Respondents were asked if they were aware of the areas open and closed to cross-country motorized use. About one-third (32.4%, n = 44) said no and 67.6% (n = 92) said yes. When the 44 respondents who said no were asked if they attempted to obtain that information, 76.5% (n = 26) said no and 23.5% (n = 8) said yes (ten responses were not recorded). When those who said they were aware of the open and closed areas were asked where they obtained that information, the most frequently mention (26 respondents) source was family, friends, or local residents. Signs, brochures, kiosks, and maps were mentioned by 21 respondents, 18 said BLM office, personnel, or website, seven said the fence, and six said the internet.

That question was followed up by asking the respondents to “Please indicate the reasons you think that closed areas are closed and why others are open?” Of the 139 respondents, 98 (70.5%) answered the question. Most frequently mentioned reasons (n = 39) were attributed to political or environmental groups. One person said that there are “too many activists seeking to close all state and federal land to OHV use” while another said that “government and eco-nut bureaucrats are trying to justify their jobs and seize my freedom.” The next most frequently mention reason (n = 25) were endangered cactus, plants, cactus habitat, or flora. Conservation, land protection, or environmental preservation was mentioned by 19 respondents. Seven respondents referred to private land, public land, or land management. Another seven referred to other management issues such as trash, public safety, and erosion control. Six respondents indicated they did not know why areas are closed or open.

Respondents were asked if they knew what additional areas the BLM intends to open for cross-country motorized use. Only 14.4% (n = 20) said yes and 85.6% (n = 119) said no.

Comments and Concerns

At the conclusion of the formal interview, respondents were asked if they “have any additional comments or concerns about issues regarding management or development of this area?” More than one-half (51.1%, n = 71) offered comments. Their comments seem to fall within seven broader topical areas:

1. Open up more riding areas, keep open areas open;
2. Economic benefits for local communities;
3. Disappointment over closures;
4. Unique/best off-road motorized vehicle riding area;
5. Understanding of benefits from closures;
6. Existing management activities, facility improvements; and
7. Positive environment for families and kids.

Responses total is higher than the 78 respondents due to the fact that a number of respondent’s comments touched on several of the seven topics. See Appendix B for a complete transcript of comments.

Open up more riding areas, keep open areas open. This was, by far, the topic that generated the most responses (n = 46). Some of the respondents stressed that they would like to see the area around Factory Butte opened to motorized travel. One person said simply, “Open up the Butte” while another said, “The US Fish & Wildlife needs to finish their study, contact the BLM so Factory Butte can be opened up” while another talked about the purpose of the fence, “We would like to see the fence that we, the riders, helped build get put to use so we can open the corridor and have additional riding area.” Several appreciated the fact that they had areas to ride with one commenting, “I would just like to see the area stay open” another referred to the BLM, “Thanks to the BLM for keeping some area open for use and providing education to keep it that way.”

Economic benefits for local communities. Although there were only two comments regarding economic benefits derived from visitors spending money in local businesses, they are worth noting because the topic relates to overall community vitality. One person said, “We drove from Minnesota to ride here, stay in hotels, eat at restaurants, get gas, etc. This area is best used as it is, and I also think it helps the economy in this area—as well as giving families a great destination,” while the other said they “hope that we will be able to use this area and possibly bring in more riders to bring in income to the local towns.”

Disappointment over closures. A total of five respondents specifically addressed the lack of areas that were traditionally use by motorized vehicles. One respondent said they were “Disappointed in the closure. Please let us use our land,” while another addressed the threatened cactus species, “Don’t lie about plants that are not in the riding areas.” Another had doubts about visiting the area again, “Not sure if I’ll ever be coming back. Limited space to recreate on.” Another expressed doubts over the validity of information used to authorize the closures, “This area should be re-opened to all motorized vehicle use. It was closed due to false information shared by a number of professionals and professional organizations such as SUWA. There has never been a species of plant or animal harmed in the entire area.”

Unique/best off-road motorized vehicle riding area. Five respondents pointed out the fact that Swing Arm City-Factory Butte area is unique and well known in the off-road riding community. One respondent

simply said, “This land is the most ‘preemo’ land for riding,” while several another pointed out the area’s prominent reputation, “I do believe it is of the upmost importance to allow some of the world recognized OHV areas to remain for the enjoyment of OHV use,” and “This is the best place to ride in America. Bikes (motorcycles) are not hurting it.”

Understanding of benefits from closures. Although only two respondents specifically said they understood the reasoning behind area closures, it seems that it was a underlying sentiment from other respondents. One respondent said, “I do understand the need to protect and manage our land.” The other respondent commenting on this subject said, “Just want these areas to stay open. If areas are designated it helps, as long as people follow it. I like how a lot of areas have been designated riding areas nowadays.”

Existing management activities, facility improvements. The topic that generated the second most number of comments (n = 19) relate to the management of the area with some offering ideas for facility improvements. One person said, “I think if there were some garbage cans to help clean up it would help. I love the free unregulated camping and riding.” Another talked about signage, “Signage saying gas/food/etc. in highly populated areas would be nice. For example—Next food/H2O, phone, help (emergency) located 3mi.” Another told about his experience with a BLM employee, “BLM ranger very helpful. Acted like he wanted us to have a good time. Need more government guys like him. I could tell he would enforce the law.” Another appreciated not having to pay a fee, “Thanks for keeping the area open and allowing it to be free,” while another thought it would be a good idea for a “Medical transport and/or facility more readily available.” One person simply said “This place rocks. Thank you.”

Positive environment for families and kids. Nine respondents specifically talked about the positive family and kid friendly atmosphere. One person pointed out, “It’s a great place to ride. Wide open—good spot for kids to learn.” One respondent was disheartened that he is not allowed to take his child to places he went when he was young, “I wish they would open the rest of Factory Butte. I grew up in Wayne County and we use to take rides out there when I was a kid. It’s sad that I can’t take my son now.” One respondent would like to allow kids to learn to ride on their own:

“We come down here to an open area to ride. All this area should be open because after it rains you don’t even know we were here. There are no tracks left. We would like our little children under 8 to be able to ride without an adult on back. We keep watch on them and they have all the proper gear. It should be only our choice to let our children ride. We are responsible for them.”

There were several people who appreciated the location for tradition family get together:

“We have been coming here since 1980. This is our family’s Easter tradition. We don’t want anything to change here. We come here because there aren’t a million people and it is a safer place for our kids to learn to ride. We also are glad that ambulances and EMT’s are nearby in case of accident. Please, please, please don’t shut this area down or make us pay to come here,” and “We absolutely love coming here and having fun so please do not attempt to do any changes to it. It is our families’ Easter tradition.”

References

- BLM. 2006. Notice of Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Travel Restriction for Factory Butte Area, Utah [Federal Register Notice]. Available online at http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/prog/recreation/what_do_you_want_to/off_highway_vehicles/factory_butte/federal_register_notice.html
- BLM. n.d. Ready to Ride! [pamphlet]. Available online at http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/ut/natural_resources/recreation/ohv/factory_butte.Par.26603.File.dat/FactoryButte_v6.pdf
- High Country News*. October 16, 2006. Mother Nature rides an ATV. Available online at <http://www.hcn.org/issues/332/16622>
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 2009. Endangered Species Program [website]. Available online at <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esasum.html>

Appendix A
(Survey Instrument)

2010 SWING ARM CITY-FACTORY BUTTE SURVEY QUESTIONS

Date: _____	Day: M Tu W Th F S Su
Time: _____	Location: _____

1. Where are you from? (city, county, state): _____

2. What is your zip code? _____

3. Is this the first time you have visited this area? ☐ Yes ☐ No**If Yes, skip to question 8.**

4. Approximately, how many years has it been since you first visited the area?

☐ 1-2 years☐ 3-5 years☐ 6-10 years☐ 10-20 years☐ more than 20 years

5. How many times do you come to this area in a typical year? _____

6. How long do you stay on a typical trip? _____ hours or _____ days7. How many people are in your group on a typical trip? _____

8. How long are you staying on this trip? _____ hours or _____ days

9. Have you stayed overnight in this area before, or will you be staying overnight in this area on this trip?

☐ Yes ☐ No (if you are from the Hanksville-Caineville area and not camping out, mark "no")**If No → go to question 13.**

10. If yes, where did you stay or where will you stay?

☐ Hotel/motel → **go to question 13**☐ Staying with family or friends → **go to question 13**☐ Camped out → where did you camp?☐ Front side of Swing Arm☐ Back side of Swing Arm☐ On fence line/hill top☐ Other _____

11. If you camped, in general, how satisfied are you with the area where you camped?

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

12. If Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied, what factors detracted from the quality of your campground?

13. How many people are in your group today? _____

14. What is your primary recreation activity in the area during this trip?

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Off-road motorcycle riding | <input type="checkbox"/> Hiking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ATV riding | <input type="checkbox"/> Camping |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Off-road motorcycle and ATV riding | <input type="checkbox"/> Photography |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other off-highway vehicle riding | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

15. List any other recreation activities you participated in or are planning to participate in.

16. In general, how satisfied are you with your trip to this area?

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

17. If Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied, what factors detracted from the quality of your trip?

18. What type of campsite would you prefer to use when you visit the area?

- ☐ I never plan on camping in the area
- ☐ Undeveloped sites (no toilets or other facilities)
- ☐ Semi-developed sites with vault toilets and fire rings
- ☐ Developed sites with vault toilets, parking, picnic tables, and fire grills
- ☐ Highly developed sites with flush toilets, showers, running water, and utility hookups

19. What recreation facility improvements would you like to see in the area?

20. Are you a member of any off-highway vehicle groups or clubs? ☐ Yes ☐ No

21. If Yes, which ones?

22. Are you a member of any environmental or conservation organization? ☐ Yes ☐ No

23. If Yes, which ones?

24. How did you first find out about the Factory Butte area?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Off road groups or clubs | <input type="checkbox"/> Federal government agency offices/personnel |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other groups or clubs | <input type="checkbox"/> Guidebook |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friends/family | <input type="checkbox"/> Advertisement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/television | <input type="checkbox"/> Tour guide |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle dealer/parts store | <input type="checkbox"/> Local government organizations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Magazine or newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> Maps produced by the BLM |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Web sites | <input type="checkbox"/> Other maps or mapping software |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ | |

25. Did you actively seek information about current use regulations, or regulation changes before your current trip to the area? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, go to question 27.

26. If Yes, what information sources did you use?

27. Have you read the information provided on the kiosks? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, go to question 31.

28. If Yes, was the information useful? ☐ Yes ☐ No

29. In what ways was the information useful?

30. In what ways was the information not useful?

31. Have you heard of the emergency closure at Factory Butte? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, go to question 33.

32. If Yes, what is your understanding of the reason for the emergency closure?

33. Are you aware of the areas open and closed to cross-country motorized use? ☐ Yes ☐ No

34. If Yes, what sources provided that information?

35. If No, did you attempt to obtain that information?

☐ Yes

☐ No

36. Please indicate the reasons you think that closed areas are closed and why others are open?

37. Do you know what additional areas the BLM intends to open for cross country motorized use?

☐ Yes

☐ No

We would like to know some information about you. Your name will never be linked with this information and there will be no way in which you can be identified from it.

38. What is your gender?

☐ Male

☐ Female

39. In what year were you born? _____

40. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

☐ Less than a high school degree

☐ High school degree or GED

☐ Some college

☐ 2 year technical or associate degree

☐ 4 year college degree (BA/BS)

☐ Advanced degree (i.e. Master's, JD, MD, Ph.D.)

41. How long have you lived in your current town or city?

☐ Less than one year

☐ One to two years

☐ Three to five years

☐ Six to ten years

☐ Eleven to twenty years

☐ Over twenty years

42. Including yourself, how many people are living in your household at the present time? _____

43. Of these household members, how many are children under the age of 18? _____

44. Which of the following categories best describes your total pre-tax annual household income for 2008?

☐ Less than \$20,000

☐ \$20,000 to \$29,999

☐ \$30,000 to \$39,999

☐ \$40,000 to \$49,999

☐ \$50,000 to \$74,999

☐ \$75,000 to \$99,999

☐ \$100,000 to \$149,000

☐ \$150,000 or more

Do you have any additional comments or concerns about issues regarding management or development of this area? Please use the space below to write down additional comments.

Appendix B
(Open Ended Responses)

“Do you have any additional comments or concerns about issues regarding management or development of this area?” (71 respondents)

Open up the Butte!

We drove from Minnesota to ride here, stay in hotels, eat at restaurants, get gas, etc. This area is best used as it is, and I also think it helps the economy in this area—as well as giving families a great destination

When is tree hugger season open? It would be helpful to know what is going on before I see it is closed at the trailhead.

Disappointed in the closure. Please let us use our land. This land is the most ‘preemo’ land for riding.

I would just like to see the area stay open.

I do understand the need to protect and manage our land. However, I do believe it is of the upmost importance to allow some of the world recognized OHV areas to remain for the enjoyment of OHV use.

Just want these areas to stay open. If areas are designated it helps, as long as people follow it. I like how a lot of areas have been designated riding areas nowadays.

I think if there were some garbage cans to help clean up it would help. I love the free unregulated camping and riding.

This is the best place to ride in America. Bikes (motorcycles) are not hurting it.

Keep it open.

You should give free t-shirts with this survey!

Just that the extra areas opened up to ride.

We would like to see the fence that we, the riders, helped build get put to use so we can open the corridor and have additional riding area.

We would like to see the fence that we helped build (without the help from SUWA) get put to use and have the path opened up to the other riding area.

I hope that we will be able to use this area and possibly bring in more riders to bring in income to the local towns.

Keep it open. We will respect what we have if you just let us.

This area should be re-opened to all motorized vehicle use. It was closed due to false information shared by a number of professionals and professional organizations such as SUWA. There has never been a species of plant or animal harmed in the entire area.

Please help keep great places like this open. Riding is the best use for this land.

It's a great place to ride. Wide open—good spot for kids to learn.

We need the planned areas opened!!

Open area back up, we've been riding here for over 30 years—no reason to close it—only because of power hungry tree huggers.

I don't understand why other areas are not open. I understand that the cactus areas are fenced off. Why then is there not more areas to ride in? Some weekends can get pretty packed down here, and more areas should make it easier to be safe from major accidents.

The US Fish & Wildlife needs to finish their study, contact the BLM so Factory Butte can be opened up.

Don't lie about plants that are not in the riding areas.

You should have Xeroxed both sides of this paper! Guy @ BLM really wasn't able to inform about areas to photograph. Also—signage saying gas/food/etc. in highly populated areas would be nice. For example—Next food/H2O, phone, help (emergency) located 3mi.

I would like to see the area opened up to more usage—even just hiking. Utah is a beautiful state that deserves to be seen.

I would like to see more terrain opened for riding.

Just would like to keep places to ride/camp.

Thanks to the BLM for keeping some area open for use and providing education to keep it that way.

It's back to we the people need to run this land and not SUWA or any other special interest groups. We came down last April and had a great time, but it may be hard to come back if things are closed!

Not sure if I'll ever be coming back. Limited space to recreate on.

It's public land, it's here for man's use and so we should be able to use it.

This seems like a perfect place for cross country riding. We would like to see it continue to be open for use, especially when we drive a very long way to get here to use it.

I think that the cactus is just an excuse. It's all about control. Don't close any areas. It is public land, so let the public enjoy it.

Will you please stop closing areas. There are not very many places to ride. Plus, when you close then you hurt us. If you're not self centered you will think about that.

It manages itself! Does not need any development. Let us ride. The rain cleans the tracks. Open it up!

Open more area.

BLM ranger very helpful. Acted like he wanted us to have a good time. Need more government guys like him. I could tell he would enforce the law.

Don't close. No additional fencing off.

Don't close off it's a fun time and we don't hurt anything.

Open it all back up. No more closures.

Don't close.

I would love to see more area opened up for off-road use.

My family and friends have enjoyed coming out here to ride for the last 10 years. We really enjoy it.

This place rocks. Thank you.

More open area.

Open as much area as possible. We enjoy this area very much.

I would love to see Factory Butte open.

The guy is nice.

If there are closures, note them at the highway pull-offs. Great time. Thanks for allowing us to ride.

I really appreciate the friendly atmosphere in riding areas in Southern Utah. The employee that passed out this survey was very friendly and personable. Thanks so much.

Thanks for keeping the area open and allowing it to be free.
We love riding here. I would really hate to see this area closed.

Please keep Swing Arm City open.

Please do not close this area and please do not make this a pay per use site.

Medical transport and/or facility more readily available.

I love it here. Keep it open and responsible campers will keep it clean.

Keep it open.

We are U.S. taxpayers and we pay your salary. We would appreciate some respect. Please do not harass us. Thank you.

We come down here to an open area to ride. All this area should be open because after it rains you don't even know we were here. There are no tracks left. We would like our little children under 8 to be able to ride without an adult on back. We keep watch on them and they have all the proper gear. It should be only our choice to let our children ride. We are responsible for them.

We have been coming here since 1980. This is our family's Easter tradition. We don't want anything to change here. We come here because there aren't a million people and it is a safer place for our kids to learn to ride. We also are glad that ambulances and EMT's are nearby in case of accident. Please, please, please don't shut this area down or make us pay to come here.

We absolutely love coming here and having fun so please do not attempt to do any changes to it. It is our families' Easter tradition.

Take back control of our land before the environmentalists lock all of it up.

Would just love to be able to take the ride to Factory Butte and the pentacle, other than that, love spending Easter out here.

I wish they would open the rest of Factory Butte. I grew up in Wayne County and we use to take rides out there when I was a kid. It's sad that I can't take my son now.

The only concern I have would be to stop being so regulated with registering the bikes. If the sticker is on it for that year, why make it such a hassle to get the papers too?

This area is perfect for off-road activity. It hurts no one, nothing. Because of the terrain and lack of vegetation, it looks natural after wind and rain. It is remote with no noise or dust issues to residents. Most all users are courteous and respectful of the territory. Leave it open please.

Open Factory Butte back up.

Water spout.

That my friends and family love to come to this area.